DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 996 CG 023 817

AUTHOR Mansfield, Wendy; And Others
TITLE Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools. E.D. Tabs.
INSTITUTION Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO NCES-91-091
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 51p.; Data Series: FRSS-42.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discipline; *Drug Abuse; Drug Use; Elementary Secondary Education; National Surveys; Prevention; School Safety; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teachers

ABSTRACT

This report presents statistics on teachers' perspectives of issues related to safety, discipline, and drug use prevention in public elementary and secondary schools, resulting from a national survey of public school teachers (N=1,350) who responded to questions concerning the extent of discipline problems within schools and the nature and effectiveness of current policies and drug education programs. Tables present data for all teachers and for teachers by instructional level (elementary, secondary); type of school location (city, urban fringe, town, rural); enrollment size (less than 300, 300 to 399, 1,000 or more); region (Northeast, Central, Southeast, and West); and percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches (10 percent or less, 11 to 40 percent, 41 percent or more). Definitions are provided for terms used in the report. Highlights of the report include: (1) student alcohol use was considered a serious or moderate problem by 23 percent of teachers; (2) over 90 percent of teachers whose schools have written policies described their general discipline policies and their alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies as comprehensive and clear; and (3) almost 50 percent of teachers--both at elementary and secondary schools--indicated that a lack of or inadequate alternative placements/programs for disruptive students limited to a great or moderate extent of their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school. In addition to the data tables presenting results, the survey methodology is discussed. The appendixes include: (1) the questionnaire; and (2) standard error tables for each of the data tables in the report. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

ED338996

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

E.D. TABS

November 1991

Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Data Series:
FRSS–42

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

NCES 91-091

C6023817

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

E.D. TABS November 1991

Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools

Wendy Mansfield
Debbie Alexander
Elizabeth Farris
Westat, Inc.

Data Series:
FRSS–42

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement NCES 91-091

U.S. Department of Education
Lamar Alexander
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Diane Ravitch
Assistant Secretary

National Center for Education Statistics
Emerson J. Elliott
Acting Commissioner

National Center for Education Statistics

"The purpose of the Center shall be to collect, and analyze, and disseminate statistics and other data related to education in the United States and in other nations."—Section 406(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1221e–1).

November 1991

Contact:
Judi Carpenter
(202) 219–1333

Highlights

- Student alcohol use was considered a serious or moderate problem by 23 percent of teachers. Four percent of elementary school teachers and 54 percent of secondary school teachers thought student alcohol use was a serious or moderate problem at their school (Table 2).

- Student drug use was considered a serious or moderate problem by 17 percent of teachers. Five percent of elementary school teachers and 38 percent of secondary school teachers thought student drug use was a serious or moderate problem at their school (Table 2).

- Over 90 percent of teachers whose schools have written policies described their general discipline policies and their alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies as comprehensive and clear (Table 3). About 70 percent said their school's general discipline policy was consistently applied, and about 90 percent found their alcohol and drug policies consistently applied.

- Prevention programs and policies for both school alcohol use and drug use were considered not very or not at all effective in reducing student alcohol and drug use, according to about 5 percent of elementary school teachers and between 24 and 30 percent of secondary school teachers (Table 5).

- About half of the teachers received inservice training during the 1990-91 school year regarding both their school's general discipline programs and policies and their school's drug use prevention programs and policies (Tables 6 and 7). Across all teachers, an average of approximately 2.5 hours of inservice training was received on these topics by all teachers.

- Given a list of components included in training on drug use prevention programs and policies, over half of the teachers whose training had included the components selected the following as one of the three most effective: causes and effects of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use; identifying signs of alcohol, drugs, or tobacco use; intervention techniques for their use with students suspected of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use; and availability of school services and other services for students using alcohol, drugs, or tobacco (Table 8).

- Almost 50 percent of teachers--both at elementary and secondary schools--indicated that a lack of or inadequate alternative placements/programs for disruptive students limited to a great or moderate extent their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school (Table 10). Likelihood of complaints from parents and lack of support from administration also limited their ability for about 30 percent of teachers.

- Student alcohol and drug use interfered with teaching to a great or moderate extent for 1 to 2 percent of elementary school teachers and 9 to 11 percent of secondary school teachers; about 35 percent of both elementary and secondary teachers indicated that student disruptive behavior interfered with teaching (Table 10).

- Nineteen percent of teachers reported verbal abuse by a student in their school during the last 4 weeks, 8 percent have been threatened with injury in the last 12 months, and 2 percent have been physically attacked in the last 12 months (Table 11).

- Nearly all teachers indicated that they feel safe or moderately safe in the school building during school hours (99 percent), and at least 90 percent feel safe after school hours, on school grounds, or in the neighborhood of the school (Table 14).

Table of Contents

Section		Page
Highlights		iii
Introduction		1
Definitions		2
Tables		3
1	Percentage of teachers indicating the extent of certain problems in their school: United States, 1990-91	3
2	Percentage of teachers indicating that certain problems in their school were serious or moderate, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	4
3	Percentage of teachers reporting that their school has a written policy for general discipline and for alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and the percentage with written policies reporting them as comprehensive, clear, consistently applied, and widely publicized, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	5
4	Percentage of teachers indicating specified levels of effectiveness for their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies in reducing certain problems: United States, 1990-91	6
5	Percentage of teachers indicating that their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies were not very or not at all effective in reducing certain problems, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	7
6	Percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's general discipline programs and policies and average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	8
7	Percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use prevention programs and policies and average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	9

Table of Contents--continued

Section		Page
Tables--continued		
8	Percentage of teachers indicating whether certain components were included in the training they received regarding drug use prevention programs and policies and whether each component was considered one of the three most effective in reducing student drug use: United States, 1990-91	10
9	Percentage of teachers indicating the extent to which certain factors limit their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the extent to which certain factors interfere with teaching: United States, 1990-91	11
10	Percentage of teachers indicating that certain factors limit to a great or moderate extent their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the percentage indicating that various factors interfere to a great or moderate extent with their teaching, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	12
11	Percentage of teachers who have been verbally abused, threatened with injury, or physically attacked by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	13
12	Total and average number of incidents teachers reported of having been verbally abused in the last 4 weeks, threatened with injury in the last 12 months, or physically attacked in the last 12 months by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	14
13	Percentage of teachers indicating how safe they feel at certain school locations: United States, 1990-91	15
14	Percentage of teachers indicating that they feel safe or moderately safe at certain school locations, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	16
Text Table		
15	Number and percentage of public school teachers in the study sample that responded and the estimated number and percentage in the nation, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	19

Table of Contents—continued

Section		Page
Survey Methodology And Data Reliability		17
	Sample Selection	17
	Teacher Sampling	17
	Response Rates	18
	Sampling And Nonsampling Errors	18
	Variances	20
	Background Information	21
References		22
Appendix A: Standard Error Tables		23
1a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating the extent of certain problems in their school: United States, 1990-91	25
2a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that certain problems in their school were serious or moderate, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	26
3a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers reporting that their school has a written policy for general discipline and for alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and the percentage with written policies reporting them as comprehensive, clear, consistently applied, and widely publicized, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	27
4a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating specified levels of effectiveness for their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies in reducing certain problems: United States, 1990-91	28
5a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies were not very or not at all effective in reducing certain problems, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	29
6a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's general discipline programs and policies and of the average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	30
7a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use prevention programs and policies and of the average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	31

Table of Contents--continued

Section		Page
Standard Error Tables--continued		
8a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating whether certain components were included in the training they received regarding drug use prevention programs and policies and whether each component was considered one of the three most effective in reducing student drug use: United States, 1990-91	32
9a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating the extent to which certain factors limit their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the extent to which certain factors interfere with teaching: United States, 1990-91	33
10a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that certain factors limit to a great or moderate extent their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the percentage indicating that various factors interfere to a great or moderate extent with their teaching, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	34
11a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers who have been verbally abused, threatened with injury, or physically attacked by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	35
12a	Standard errors of the total and average number of incidents teachers reported of having been verbally abused in the last 4 weeks, threatened with injury in the last 12 months, or physically attacked in the last 12 months by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91	36
13a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating how safe they feel at certain school locations: United States, 1990-91	37
14a	Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that they feel safe or moderately safe at certain school locations, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91	38
Appendix B: Questionnaire		39

Introduction

This report presents statistics on teachers' perspectives of issues related to safety, discipline, and drug use prevention in public elementary and secondary schools. A national sample of 1,350 public school teachers responded to questions concerning the extent of discipline problems within schools and the nature and effectiveness of current policies and drug education programs.

Student alcohol and drug use, violence, and disruptive behavior are problems facing schools, and as such, they are impediments to learning. National Education Goal Six calls for all schools to be safe and drug-free with a disciplined environment conducive to learning by the year 2000. To achieve the goal, policymakers, educators, and the public need information about the current status of the nation's schools and the extent to which various objectives are being met.

The tabular summaries in this report are based on data collected from the Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The survey was conducted by Westat, Inc., a research firm in Rockville, Maryland, through the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). FRSS was designed to provide data on policy-related issues regarding emerging educational developments. The tables present data for all teachers and for teachers by instructional level (elementary, secondary), type of school location (city, urban fringe, town, rural), enrollment size (less than 300, 300 to 999, 1,000 or more), region (Northeast, Central, Southeast, and West), and percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches (10 percent or less, 11 to 40 percent, 41 percent or more).

Definitions

Common Core of Data Public School Universe — A tape containing 84,968 records, one for each public elementary and secondary school in the 50 States, District of Columbia, and five outlying areas, as reported to the National Center for Education Statistics by the State education agencies. Records on this file contain the name, address, and telephone number of the school, name of the school district or other agency that operates the school, codes for school type and locale, the full-time-equivalent number of classroom teachers assigned to the school, the number of students eligible for free-lunch program, and membership, by grade and racial/ethnic categories.

City — A central city of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

Urban Fringe — A place within an SMSA of a large or mid-size central city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of Census.

Town — A place not within an SMSA, but with a population greater than or equal to 2,500, and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of Census.

Rural — A place with population less than 2,500 and defined as rural by the U.S. Bureau of Census.

Elementary School — A school whose lowest grade is 6 or lower, and whose highest grade is 8 or lower. (Junior high and middle schools may be classified as elementary schools if their grade spans fall within this range.)

Secondary School — A school whose lowest grade is 7 or higher.

Combined School — A school whose lowest grade is 6 or lower, and whose highest grade is 9 or higher.

Full-time Equivalent (FTE) — Amount of time required to perform an assignment stated as a proportion of full-time position and computed by dividing the amount of time employed by the time normally required for a full-time position.

Drug use education — Refers to learning activities and related policies to prevent or reduce alcohol, drug (e.g., marijuana, inhalants, cocaine), and tobacco use by youth. It does not include clinical treatment or rehabilitation.

Disruptive behavior — Refers to serious and/or unlawful actions that may interfere with order in school (e.g., physical attacks, property destruction, thefts). Alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution are reported separately on the FRSS questionnaire and are not included under "disruptive behavior."

Misbehavior — Refers to less serious actions that may interfere with classroom teaching (e.g., student talking in class, tardiness, class cutting).

Northeast region — Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Central region — Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Southeast region — Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

West region — Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Table 1.--Percentage of teachers indicating the extent of certain problems in their school: United States, 1990-91

Problem	Extent of problem			
	Serious	Moderate	Minor	Not a problem
Student tardiness	10	29	39	22
Student absenteeism/class cutting	9	28	38	24
Physical conflicts among students	6	22	46	26
Robbery or theft of items over $10	3	9	38	50
Vandalism of school property	5	17	44	34
Student alcohol use	7	16	22	55
Student drug use	3	14	29	54
Sale of drugs on school grounds	1	5	25	69
Student tobacco use	5	19	26	50
Student possession of weapons	1	4	25	70
Trespassing	2	7	32	59
Verbal abuse of teachers	8	22	39	32
Physical abuse of teachers	(+)	3	18	78
Racial tensions	2	12	30	56

(+) Less than 0.5.

NOTE: Percentages are computed across each row, but may not add to 100 because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 2.--Percentage of teachers indicating that certain problems in their school were serious or moderate, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Problem	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
Student tardiness	39	31	53	47	41	34	28
Student absenteeism/ class cutting	37	25	57	44	36	38	28
Physical conflicts among students	28	32	23	37	27	25	18
Robbery or theft of items over $10	12	8	19	15	14	10	8
Vandalism of school property	22	17	30	30	20	21	16
Student alcohol use	23	4	54	16	22	28	29
Student drug use	17	5	38	17	18	18	17
Sale of drugs on school grounds	6	2	12	8	6	5	4
Student tobacco use	24	6	53	21	22	30	25
Student possession of weapons	5	3	7	10	3	3	1
Trespassing	9	9	9	16	7	5	4
Verbal abuse of teachers	29	26	35	41	28	22	21
Physical abuse of teachers	3	3	4	6	4	2	0
Racial tensions	14	12	19	20	18	10	6

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

NOTE: Percentages in the "total" column were computed by adding the percentages from the "serious" or "moderate" columns from Table 1. They may vary because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 3.--Percentage of teachers reporting that their school has a written policy for general discipline and for alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and the percentage with written policies reporting them as comprehensive, clear, consistently applied, and widely publicized, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Policy characteristic	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level[1]		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
General discipline policy							
Written	95	93	98	96	95	94	97
Comprehensive	92	92	92	91	94	91	94
Clear	92	93	90	90	95	90	94
Consistently applied	68	74	58	65	67	70	71
Widely publicized	79	81	74	75	83	77	80
Alcohol policy[2]							
Written	79	68	96	74	81	78	86
Comprehensive	93	94	92	93	95	92	92
Clear	96	98	93	93	98	95	96
Consistently applied	88	92	83	87	88	87	90
Widely publicized	77	79	74	74	79	79	78
Drug policy[2]							
Written	81	71	96	77	84	80	86
Comprehensive	93	94	92	92	95	93	92
Clear	95	98	94	93	98	95	96
Consistently applied	89	92	85	88	88	89	91
Widely publicized	79	80	77	77	80	79	81
Tobacco policy[2]							
Written	81	71	97	76	82	82	88
Comprehensive	94	94	92	92	95	92	95
Clear	96	97	95	94	98	95	97
Consistently applied	82	89	75	81	85	81	83
Widely publicized	80	81	77	76	81	80	83

[1]Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

[2]At schools where alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were included in a single policy, teachers were asked to describe each component separately.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 4.--Percentage of teachers indicating specified levels of effectiveness for their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies in reducing certain problems: United States, 1990-91

Student problem	Program and policy effectiveness*				
	Highly effective	Moderately effective	Not very effective	Not at all effective	Use or behavior not a problem
Alcohol use	14	25	12	3	46
Drug use	16	26	10	2	45
Tobacco use	14	23	14	6	43
Disruptive behavior	23	45	15	5	12
Misbehavior	22	49	17	6	6

*Approximately 1 percent of teachers reported that their school had no alcohol, drug, or tobacco prevention programs or policies or general discipline programs or policies.

NOTE: Percentages are computed across each row, but may not add to 100 because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 5.--Percentage of teachers indicating that their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies were not very or not at all effective in reducing certain problems, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Student problem	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
Alcohol use	14	4	30	12	13	16	17
Drug use	12	5	24	13	12	12	10
Tobacco use	19	6	41	18	17	24	19
Disruptive behavior	20	19	20	25	17	17	18
Misbehavior	23	22	25	30	20	19	23

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

NOTE: Percentages in the "total" column were computed by adding the percentages from the "not very effective" and "not at all effective" columns from Table 4. They may vary because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 6.--Percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's general discipline programs and policies and average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	General discipline programs and policies training			
	Percent ever receiving any training	Percent receiving inservice training during 1990-91	Average number of inservice training hours in 1990-91	
			For all teachers	For teachers receiving training
All schools	60	54	2.5	4.7
Instructional level*				
Elementary	61	54	2.7	5.0
Secondary	58	54	2.3	4.2
Location of school				
City	60	53	2.6	5.0
Urban fringe	63	55	2.5	4.5
Town	58	54	2.9	5.3
Rural	58	53	2.0	3.7
Enrollment size				
Less than 300	52	50	2.2	4.4
300 to 999	61	54	2.6	4.8
1,000 or more	62	54	2.4	4.4
Region				
Northeast	46	38	1.4	3.8
Central	54	49	2.1	4.3
Southeast	67	58	2.7	4.7
West	69	65	3.5	5.4
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	58	51	2.4	4.7
11 to 40 percent	59	53	2.5	4.7
41 percent or more	61	55	2.6	4.8

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 7.--Percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use prevention programs and policies and average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Drug use prevention programs and policies training			
	Percent ever receiving any training	Percent receiving inservice training during 1990-91	Average number of inservice training hours in 1990-91	
			For all teachers	For teachers receiving training
All schools	58	49	2.7	5.5
Instructional level*				
Elementary	55	47	2.7	5.7
Secondary	61	54	2.8	5.2
Location of school				
City	54	46	2.5	5.3
Urban fringe	57	49	2.4	4.9
Town	59	54	3.3	6.0
Rural	61	49	2.7	5.5
Enrollment size				
Less than 300	54	47	2.9	6.1
300 to 999	57	49	2.7	5.5
1,000 or more	61	53	2.7	5.1
Region				
Northeast	54	44	2.6	5.8
Central	53	44	2.5	5.6
Southeast	59	53	2.5	4.7
West	63	55	3.1	5.7
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	60	48	2.8	5.8
11 to 40 percent	58	50	2.6	5.2
41 percent or more	52	47	2.6	5.6

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 8.--Percentage of teachers indicating whether certain components were included in the training they received regarding drug use prevention programs and policies and whether each component was considered one of the three most effective in reducing student drug use: United States, 1990-91

Component	Included in training	One of three most effective components*
Causes and effects of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	89	55
Identifying signs of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	91	68
Intervention techniques for your use with students suspected of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	77	64
Application and enforcement of alcohol policies	69	17
Application and enforcement of drug policies	70	19
Application and enforcement of tobacco policies	66	11
Laws regarding alcohol, drug, or tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution	64	30
Availability of school services and other services for students using alcohol, drugs, or tobacco	86	63

*Percentages in this column are of those teachers whose training included the relevant component.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 9.--Percentage of teachers indicating the extent to which certain factors limit their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the extent to which certain factors interfere with teaching: United States, 1990-91

Factor	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
Factor limiting ability to maintain order and discipline				
Lack of or inadequate number of security personnel	3	7	13	76
Lack of or inadequate teacher training in discipline procedures and school law	4	14	26	55
Lack of or inadequate alternative placements/ programs for disruptive students	24	24	23	29
Likelihood of complaints from parents	9	22	35	34
Lack of support from administration	11	17	23	49
Faculty's fear of student reprisal	1	7	22	70
Factor interfering with teaching				
Student alcohol use	1	4	13	83
Student drug use	1	4	16	79
Student disruptive behavior	12	22	36	30
Student misbehavior	14	30	44	12

NOTE: Percentages are computed across each row, but may not add to 100 because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 10.--Percentage of teachers indicating that certain factors limit to a great or moderate extent their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the percentage indicating that various factors interfere to a great or moderate extent with their teaching, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Factor	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
Factor limiting ability to maintain order and discipline							
Lack of or inadequate number of security personnel	11	8	15	18	9	9	4
Lack of or inadequate teacher training in discipline procedures and school law	18	16	21	22	18	16	17
Lack of or inadequate alternative placements/ programs for disruptive students	48	48	49	58	46	42	43
Likelihood of complaints from parents	31	30	32	33	27	31	31
Lack of support from administration	28	25	32	33	26	26	24
Faculty's fear of student reprisal	8	7	8	11	6	6	8
Factor interfering with teaching							
Student alcohol use	4	2	9	5	4	5	4
Student drug use	5	1	11	7	5	4	2
Student disruptive behavior	34	35	34	43	31	31	29
Student misbehavior	44	45	43	53	46	37	36

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

NOTE: Percentages in the "total" column were computed by adding the percentages from the "great extent" and "moderate extent" columns from Table 9. They may vary because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 11.--Percentage of teachers who have been verbally abused, threatened with injury, or physically attacked by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Percent of teachers					
	Ever verbally abused by student	Verbally abused in the last 4 weeks of school[1]	Ever threatened with injury by student	Threatened with injury in the last 12 months	Ever physically attacked by student[2]	Physically attacked in the last 12 months[2]
All schools	51	19	16	8	7	2
Instructional level[3]						
Elementary	46	18	14	7	7	3
Secondary	58	22	20	10	5	2
Location of school						
City	57	28	25	15	9	3
Urban fringe	50	17	13	6	8	3
Town	50	16	15	7	6	3
Rural	42	12	10	4	4	(+)
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	43	11	12	4	3	1
300 to 999	50	20	16	9	8	3
1,000 or more	57	23	20	9	5	2
Region						
Northeast	50	18	17	9	9	2
Central	51	18	14	5	6	2
Southeast	52	23	18	10	6	4
West	49	18	16	9	7	2
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches						
10 percent or less	48	14	10	3	3	1
11 to 40 percent	49	19	17	8	7	2
41 percent or more	54	25	21	13	10	5

(+) Less than 0.5.

[1]The 4-week time period covers the 4 weeks prior to the teacher completing the questionnaire.

[2]The types of behavior included under physical attack may range widely, from being kicked in anger by a first grader to more serious physical attacks by high school students.

[3]Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 12.--Total and average number of incidents teachers reported of having been verbally abused in the last 4 weeks, threatened with injury in the last 12 months, or physically attacked in the last 12 months by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Number of times incident occurred					
	Verbally abused by student in the last 4 weeks[1]		Threatened with injury by student in the last 12 months		Physically attacked by student in the last 12 months[2]	
	Total (in thousands)	Average for all teachers[3]	Total (in thousands)	Average for all teachers[3]	Total (in thousands)	Average for all teachers[3]
All schools	1,876	0.98	385	0.20	77	0.04
Instructional level[4]						
Elementary	1,019	0.89	270	0.24	63	0.05
Secondary	830	1.18	107	0.15	13	0.02
Location of school						
City	1,028	1.81	265	0.47	44	0.08
Urban fringe	328	0.63	53	0.10	16	0.03
Town	324	0.69	42	0.09	16	0.03
Rural	197	0.54	25	0.07	1	(+)
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	149	0.57	25	0.10	1	0.01
300 to 999	1,247	1.02	301	0.25	68	0.06
1,000 or more	480	1.11	58	0.14	8	0.02
Region						
Northeast	215	0.52	63	0.15	9	0.02
Central	539	1.15	45	0.10	10	0.02
Southeast	680	1.37	189	0.38	44	0.09
West	443	0.81	88	0.16	13	0.02
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches						
10 percent or less	317	0.64	17	0.04	4	0.01
11 to 40 percent	566	0.73	99	0.13	17	0.02
41 percent or more	925	1.60	256	0.44	54	0.09

(+) Less than 0.005.

[1]The 4-week time period covers the 4 weeks prior to the teacher completing the questionnaire.

[2]The types of behavior included under physical attack may range widely, from being kicked in anger by a first grader to more serious physical attacks by high school students.

[3]Means include those teachers reporting 0 occurrences.

[4]Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

NOTE: Numbers may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 13.--Percentage of teachers indicating how safe they feel at certain school locations: United States, 1990-91

School location	Level of safety			
	Safe	Moderately safe	Moderately unsafe	Unsafe
In the school building during school hours	88	11	1	(+)
In the school building after school hours.....	68	24	6	2
On school grounds/campus.....	79	17	3	1
In the neighborhood of the school	72	19	5	4

(+) Less than 0.5.

NOTE: Percentages are computed across each row, but may not add to 100 because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 14.--Percentage of teachers indicating that they feel safe or moderately safe at certain school locations, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

School location	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
In the school building during school hours	99	99	99	98	99	99	100
In the school building after school hours	92	90	95	85	95	94	98
On school grounds/campus	96	95	98	92	97	98	99
In the neighborhood of the school	90	87	95	79	92	95	98

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

NOTE: Percentages in the "total" column were computed by adding the percentages from the "safe" and "moderately safe" columns from Table 13. They may vary because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Survey Methodology and Data Reliability

Sample Selection

A two-stage sampling process was used to selected teachers for the FRSS Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools. The samples were selected in stages. First, a stratified sample of 890 schools was drawn from the 1988-89 list of public schools compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This file contains about 85,000 listings and is part of the NCES Common Core of Data (CCD) School Universe. Regular, vocational education, and alternative schools in the 50 states and District of Columbia were included in the survey universe, while special education schools were excluded from the frame prior to sampling. Schools not operated by local education agencies and those including only prekindergarten or kindergarten were also excluded. With these exclusions, the final sampling frame consisted of approximately 81,100 eligible schools.

The schools were stratified by type of locale (city, urban fringe, town, rural) and level of instruction (elementary, secondary, and combined schools). Within each of the 12 strata, schools were sorted first by state, then district (within each state), and then enrollment size (within each district). Next schools were selected with probabilities proportionate to the square root of the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) teachers in the school. The sampling of schools was followed by the sampling of teachers within the selected schools. Teachers were selected at rates designed to yield a target sample of approximately 1,600 to 1,700, which was estimated to be sufficiently large to produce reliable estimates for national data (coefficients of variation, or c.v.'s, of 3 percent or less on a 50-percent characteristic) and for data by various school characteristics (c.v.'s of 4 to 6 percent on a 50-percent characteristic).

Teacher Sampling

Each school was contacted by telephone and requested to produce a list of eligible teachers for sampling purposes. Eligible teachers included persons assigned at the school full time whose primary duty was teaching, and excluded principals, special education teachers, itinerant teachers (unless at their home base school), substitute teachers, teachers' aides, unpaid volunteers, and preschool teachers. Using a list of randomly generated line numbers, a telephone interviewer specified the sequence numbers of the teachers on the list who were to be included in the survey. On average, one or

two teachers were selected per school, with the actual number ranging from 0 to 7. The ineligibility of some teachers and the use of square root of FTE (rather than FTE) in the sample design resulted in somewhat increased sampling variability; the final sampling rate yielded less than 2 teachers per school, and the sample totaled 1,455 rather than the desired 1,600 to 1,700. The interviewer also requested that a copy of the list used for sampling be sent to Westat for review. A response rate of 96 percent was obtained at the first stage of teacher sampling; that is, 96 percent of the 884 eligible schools (6 of the 890 schools were out of scope) allowed teachers to be sampled for this survey.

Response Rates

In mid-April 1991, questionnaires (see Appendix B) were mailed to teachers in the sample. Telephone followup of nonrespondents was initiated in mid-May; data collection was completed by the end of June. For the eligible teachers that received surveys (7 of the 1,455 teachers were found to be out of scope), a response rate of 93 percent (1,350 teachers) was obtained (see table 15). Since the teacher sample was a two-stage sample, the final response rate is the product of the first stage of teacher sampling (the school response rate of 96 percent) and the second stage of teacher sampling (the teacher response rate of 93 percent), or 89 percent. Item nonresponse ranged from 0.0 percent to 4.2 percent (except for the ranking in question 8 of the most effective components included in training on drug use prevention programs and policies, which ranged from 4.3 percent to 6.0 percent).

Sampling and Nonsampling Errors

The response data were weighted to produce national estimates. The weights used for estimation were equal to the reciprocal of the probability of selecting the teacher, multiplied by an adjustment to account for school and teacher nonresponse. The findings in this report are estimates based on the sample selected and, consequently, are subject to sampling variability.

The survey estimates are also subject to nonsampling errors that can arise because of nonobservation (nonresponse or noncoverage) errors, errors of reporting, and errors made in collection of the data. These errors can sometimes bias the data. Nonsampling errors may include such problems as the differences in the respondents' interpretation of the meaning of the questions; memory effects; misrecording of responses; incorrect editing, coding, and data entry; differences related to the particular time the survey was conducted; or errors in data preparation. While general sampling theory can be

Table 15.--Number and percentage of public school teachers in the study sample that responded and the estimated number and percentage in the nation, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Respondents		National Estimate*	
	Number	Percent	Number (in thousands)	Percent
All teachers	1,350	100	1,923	100
Instructional level				
Combined	42	3	60	3
Elementary	809	60	1,141	59
Secondary	471	35	707	37
Location of school				
City	356	26	570	30
Urban fringe	347	26	517	27
Town	344	26	471	25
Rural	303	22	365	19
Enrollment size				
Less than 300	242	18	260	14
300 to 999	848	63	1,230	64
1,000 or more	260	19	432	23
Region				
Northeast	281	21	410	21
Central	353	26	470	24
Southeast	340	25	497	26
West	376	28	546	28
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	337	25	492	26
11 to 40 percent	555	41	779	41
41 percent or more	408	30	582	30
Not available	50	4	70	4

*Data presented in all tables are weighted to produce national estimates. The sample was selected in two stages. At the first stage, schools were selected with probabilities proportionate to the square root of the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) teachers in the school. Schools with larger FTEs have higher probabilities of inclusion and lower weights. At the second stage of sampling, an average of two teachers per school was selected for the survey.

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 and numbers may not add to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

used to determine how to estimate the sampling variability of a statistic, nonsampling errors are not easy to measure and, for measurement purposes, usually require that an experiment be conducted as part of the data collection procedures or that data external to the study be used.

To minimize the potential for nonsampling errors, the questionnaire was pretested with teachers like those who completed the survey. During the design of the survey and the survey pretest, an effort was made to check for consistency of interpretation of questions and to eliminate ambiguous items. The questionnaire and instructions were extensively reviewed by the National Center for Education Statistics, as well as the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the Office of the Undersecretary, and the Drug Planning and Outreach Staff, Office of Elementary/Secondary Education, in the Department of Education. Manual and machine editing of the questionnaires were conducted to check the data for accuracy and consistency. Cases with missing or inconsistent items were recontacted by telephone. Imputations for item nonresponse were not implemented, as item nonresponse rates were less than 5 percent (except for the one item discussed above). Data were keyed with 100 percent verification.

Variances

The standard error is a measure of the variability due to sampling when estimating statistics. It indicates the variability in the population of possible estimates of a parameter for a given sample size. Standard errors can be used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.96 standard errors below to 1.96 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the true population parameter being estimated in about 95 percent of the samples. This is a 95 percent confidence interval. For example, the estimated percentage of teachers who were ever verbally abused by a student is 51 percent, and the estimated standard error is 1.2 percent. The 95 percent confidence interval for the statistic extends from 51 - (1.2 times 1.96) to 51 + (1.2 times 1.96), or from 49 to 53 percent.

Estimates of standard errors were computed using a technique known as jackknife replication. As with any replication method, jackknife replication involves constructing a number of subsamples (replicates) from the full sample and computing the statistic of interest for each replicate. The mean square error of the replicate estimates around the full sample estimate provides an estimate of the variance of the statistic (e.g., Wolter, 1985, Chapter 4). To construct the replications, 30 stratified subsamples of the full sample were created and then dropped one at a time to define 30 jackknife

replicates (e.g., Wolter, 1985, page 183). A proprietary computer program (WESVAR), available at Westat, Inc., was used to calculate the estimates of standard errors. The software runs under IBM/OS and VAX/VMS systems.

Background Information

The survey was performed under contract with Westat, Inc., using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). Westat's Project Director was Elizabeth Farris, and the Survey Managers were Wendy Mansfield, Sheila Heaviside, and Debbie Alexander. Judi Carpenter was the NCES Project Officer. The data requestor was Mary Frase, Data Development Division, NCES; outside consultants were Ollie Moles, Office of Research, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and Kimmon Richards, Planning and Evaluation Service, the Office of the Undersecretary.

The report reviewers were Michael Guerra, Consultant, Resource Group on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, and National Catholic Educational Association; Ollie Moles; Nancy Pearce, Information Collection Management Branch, Division of Data Policy, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and Kimmon Richards. NCES report reviewers were Larry Ogle, Data Development Division, and Ching C. Yu, Education Assessment Division.

Two related surveys on safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools were conducted along with the teacher survey: a survey of school principals and a survey of district superintendents. E.D. TABS on both of these surveys are forthcoming. Finally, a report examining the data from the three surveys will be produced.

For more information about the Fast Response Survey System or the Surveys on Safe, Disciplined, Drug-Free Schools, contact Judi Carpenter, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20008-5651, telephone (202) 219-1333.

References

The WESVAR Procedures. 1989. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Wolter, K. 1985. *Introduction to Variance Estimation*. Springer-Verlag.

Appendix A: Standard Error Tables

Table 1a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating the extent of certain problems in their school: United States, 1990-91

Problem	Extent of problem			
	Serious	Moderate	Minor	Not a problem
Student tardiness	0.9	1.3	1.2	1.1
Student absenteeism/class cutting	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.2
Physical conflicts among students	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.2
Robbery or theft of items over $10	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.2
Vandalism of school property	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.0
Student alcohol use	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.2
Student drug use	0.4	0.8	1.2	1.1
Sale of drugs on school grounds	0.2	0.8	1.0	1.2
Student tobacco use	0.6	1.0	1.3	1.2
Student possession of weapons	0.3	0.5	0.9	1.0
Trespassing	0.3	0.5	1.3	1.4
Verbal abuse of teachers	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.4
Physical abuse of teachers	0.2	0.5	1.0	1.2
Racial tensions	0.4	1.1	1.3	1.6

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 2a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that certain problems in their school were serious or moderate, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Problem	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
Student tardiness	1.5	2.1	2.3	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.8
Student absenteeism/ class cutting	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.9
Physical conflicts among students	1.2	1.8	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.1
Robbery or theft of items over $10	0.9	1.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.9
Vandalism of school property	1.0	1.4	2.6	2.1	2.0	2.4	1.9
Student alcohol use	0.9	0.7	2.4	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.5
Student drug use	0.8	0.7	2.0	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.7
Sale of drugs on school grounds	0.8	0.6	1.9	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.2
Student tobacco use	1.2	0.9	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.8
Student possession of weapons	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.9	0.9	0.8	0.6
Trespassing	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.1	1.1
Verbal abuse of teachers	1.4	1.8	3.0	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.7
Physical abuse of teachers	0.6	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.0
Racial tensions	1.2	1.2	2.0	2.6	2.3	1.7	1.6

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 3a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers reporting that their school has a written policy for general discipline and for alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and the percentage with written policies reporting them as comprehensive, clear, consistently applied, and widely publicized, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Policy characteristic	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level[1]		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
General discipline policy							
Written	0.5	0.8	0.6	1.2	1.0	1.3	0.9
Comprehensive	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.5	1.3
Clear	0.6	0.7	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.4
Consistently applied	1.2	1.7	1.8	3.0	2.7	2.2	2.6
Widely publicized	1.0	1.3	2.1	1.7	2.3	2.0	2.0
Alcohol policy[2]							
Written	1.0	1.6	0.9	2.5	1.5	1.8	1.7
Comprehensive	0.8	0.8	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.7	2.1
Clear	0.6	0.6	1.3	1.2	0.7	1.2	1.6
Consistently applied	1.0	1.2	1.5	2.2	2.3	1.8	1.8
Widely publicized	1.4	1.5	2.4	2.4	3.0	2.1	2.8
Drug policy[2]							
Written	1.0	1.6	0.8	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.7
Comprehensive	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.6
Clear	0.5	0.6	1.1	1.1	0.9	1.3	1.1
Consistently applied	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.4	1.9	1.5
Widely publicized	1.4	1.6	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.2
Tobacco policy[2]							
Written	0.9	1.5	0.8	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.7
Comprehensive	0.8	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.5
Clear	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.3	0.9	1.1	1.0
Consistently applied	1.1	1.3	1.8	2.3	2.5	1.9	2.4
Widely publicized	1.4	1.8	2.6	2.5	2.8	1.9	2.6

[1]Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

[2]At schools where alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were included in a single policy, teachers were asked to describe each component separately.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 4a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating specified levels of effectiveness for their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies in reducing certain problems: United States, 1990-91

Student problem	Program and policy effectiveness*				
	Highly effective	Moderately effective	Not very effective	Not at all effective	Use or behavior not a problem
Alcohol use	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.9
Drug use	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.3	1.1
Tobacco use	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.7	1.0
Disruptive behavior	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.6	1.0
Misbehavior	1.2	1.6	1.2	0.7	0.7

*Approximately 1 percent of teachers reported that their school had no alcohol, drug, or tobacco prevention programs or policies or general discipline programs or policies.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 5a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that their school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policies and general discipline programs and policies were not very or not at all effective in reducing certain problems, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Student problem	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
Alcohol use	0.9	0.7	2.2	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8
Drug use	0.9	0.8	2.0	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.3
Tobacco use	1.0	0.8	2.1	1.3	1.6	2.7	1.8
Disruptive behavior	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.0	1.6
Misbehavior	1.6	2.1	2.4	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.2

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 6a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's general discipline programs and policies and of the average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	General discipline programs and policies training			
	Percent ever receiving any training	Percent receiving inservice training during 1990-91	Average number of inservice training hours in 1990-91	
			For all teachers	For teachers receiving training
All schools	1.4	1.2	0.16	0.29
Instructional level*				
Elementary	1.7	1.4	0.18	0.33
Secondary	2.8	2.6	0.33	0.58
Location of school				
City	3.0	2.9	0.29	0.46
Urban fringe	2.9	2.6	0.25	0.41
Town	2.8	2.5	0.57	1.02
Rural	3.4	3.3	0.22	0.42
Enrollment size				
Less than 300	3.3	3.0	0.35	0.66
300 to 999	1.9	1.6	0.22	0.39
1,000 or more	3.0	3.5	0.24	0.42
Region				
Northeast	2.8	2.2	0.17	0.42
Central	2.8	2.4	0.47	0.98
Southeast	2.7	3.2	0.26	0.31
West	2.3	2.2	0.34	0.47
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	2.8	2.6	0.36	0.67
11 to 40 percent	2.1	2.2	0.36	0.60
41 percent or more	2.6	2.1	0.21	0.33

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 7a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers receiving training regarding their school's drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use prevention programs and policies and of the average number of inservice training hours received, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Drug use prevention programs and policies training			
	Percent ever receiving any training	Percent receiving inservice training during 1990-91	Average number of inservice training hours in 1990-91	
			For all teachers	For teachers receiving training
All schools	1.3	1.2	0.15	0.31
Instructional level*				
Elementary	2.0	1.8	0.18	0.36
Secondary	2.9	3.0	0.30	0.55
Location of school				
City	3.3	2.7	0.26	0.55
Urban fringe	2.3	2.3	0.31	0.60
Town	2.3	2.1	0.36	0.61
Rural	2.6	3.2	0.36	0.60
Enrollment size				
Less than 300	3.9	3.7	0.35	0.67
300 to 999	1.4	1.4	0.16	0.35
1,000 or more	3.8	4.0	0.39	0.74
Region				
Northeast	3.0	2.7	0.31	0.60
Central	2.6	2.8	0.31	0.70
Southeast	2.6	2.5	0.30	0.56
West	2.7	2.7	0.31	0.48
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	2.6	2.7	0.37	0.76
11 to 40 percent	2.2	1.9	0.22	0.43
41 percent or more	3.1	2.3	0.24	0.52

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 8a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating whether certain components were included in the training they received regarding drug use prevention programs and policies and whether each component was considered one of the three most effective in reducing student drug use: United States, 1990-91

Component	Included in training	One of three most effective components
Causes and effects of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	1.0	1.9
Identifying signs of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	1.1	1.4
Intervention techniques for your use with students suspected of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	1.7	1.8
Application and enforcement of alcohol policies	1.8	1.4
Application and enforcement of drug policies	1.8	1.5
Application and enforcement of tobacco policies	1.7	1.2
Laws regarding alcohol, drug, or tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution	1.7	2.5
Availability of school services and other services for students using alcohol, drugs, or tobacco	1.3	1.5

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 9a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating the extent to which certain factors limit their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the extent to which certain factors interfere with teaching: United States, 1990-91

Factor	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
Factor limiting ability to maintain order and discipline				
Lack of or inadequate number of security personnel	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.3
Lack of or inadequate teacher training in discipline procedures and school law	0.5	0.9	1.2	1.3
Lack of or inadequate alternatives placements/ programs for disruptive students	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.4
Likelihood of complaints from parents	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.1
Lack of support from administration	0.8	1.0	1.4	1.7
Faculty's fear of student reprisal	0.2	0.7	1.1	1.4
Factor interfering with teaching				
Student alcohol use	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9
Student drug use	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9
Student disruptive behavior	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.3
Student misbehavior	1.2	1.1	1.5	0.9

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 10a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that certain factors limit to a great or moderate extent their ability to maintain order and discipline in their school, and the percentage indicating that various factors interfere to a great or moderate extent with their teaching, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

Factor	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
Factor limiting ability to maintain order and discipline							
Lack of or inadequate number of security personnel	0.8	1.1	1.6	2.1	1.7	1.4	1.2
Lack of or inadequate teacher training in discipline procedures and school law	1.0	1.3	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.1	1.8
Lack of or inadequate alternative placements/ programs for disruptive students	1.5	2.0	2.7	2.6	2.9	3.0	2.5
Likelihood of complaints from parents	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.4
Lack of support from administration	1.2	1.1	2.1	2.2	2.8	2.3	2.1
Faculty's fear of student reprisal	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.4
Factor interfering with teaching							
Student alcohol use	0.6	0.5	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2
Student drug use	0.6	0.5	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.0
Student disruptive behavior	1.4	2.0	2.3	2.5	3.0	2.6	1.9
Student misbehavior	1.5	2.3	2.4	3.1	2.9	2.3	2.3

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 11a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers who have been verbally abused, threatened with injury, or physically attacked by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Every verbally abused by student	Verbally abused in the last 4 weeks of school[1]	Ever threatened with injury by student	Threatened with injury in the last 12 months	Ever physically attacked	Physically attacked in the last 12 months
All schools	1.2	1.3	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.5
Instructional level[2]						
Elementary	2.0	1.9	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.6
Secondary	2.5	1.8	2.2	1.5	1.1	0.7
Location of school						
City	3.1	2.6	2.0	1.8	1.6	0.9
Urban fringe	2.1	2.1	1.6	1.2	1.5	0.8
Town	2.7	1.9	1.8	1.2	1.4	1.1
Rural	2.5	1.6	1.6	1.1	1.2	0.4
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	3.3	2.2	2.1	1.4	1.1	0.5
300 to 999	1.7	1.6	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.7
1,000 or more	3.0	3.1	2.8	1.9	1.6	0.7
Region						
Northeast	2.8	2.2	1.9	1.9	1.4	0.8
Central	2.4	2.3	2.2	1.2	1.4	0.9
Southeast	2.4	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.3	1.1
West	2.3	2.2	1.9	1.3	1.1	1.0
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches						
10 percent or less	2.4	1.9	1.8	0.8	1.0	0.5
11 to 40 percent	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.2	1.2	0.6
41 percent or more	2.0	2.3	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.0

[1]The 4-week time period covers the 4 weeks prior to the teacher completing the questionnaire.

[2]Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 12a.--Standard errors of the total and average number of incidents teachers reported of having been verbally abused in the last 4 weeks, threatened with injury in the last 12 months, or physically attacked in the last 12 months by a student from their school, by school characteristics: United States, 1990-91

School characteristic	Number of times incident occurred					
	Verbally abused by student in the last 4 weeks[1]		Threatened with injury by student in the last 12 months		Physically attacked by student in the last 12 months	
	Total (in thousands)	Average[2]	Total (in thousands)	Average[2]	Total (in thousands)	Average[2]
All schools	327	0.16	106	0.06	25	0.01
Instructional level[3]						
Elementary	136	0.11	107	0.09	23	0.02
Secondary	262	0.37	19	0.02	5	0.01
Location of school						
City	301	0.52	104	0.18	23	0.04
Urban fringe	94	0.18	16	0.03	5	0.01
Town	67	0.14	7	0.02	5	0.01
Rural	63	0.17	8	0.02	1	(+)
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	43	0.16	9	0.03	1	(+)
300 to 999	257	0.21	105	0.09	24	0.02
1,000 or more	175	0.37	15	0.03	3	0.01
Region						
Northeast	39	0.09	17	0.04	3	0.01
Central	231	0.50	14	0.03	5	0.01
Southeast	217	0.40	103	0.21	24	0.05
West	107	0.18	15	0.03	6	0.01
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches						
10 percent or less	155	0.31	6	0.01	2	(+)
11 to 40 percent	108	0.14	18	0.02	7	0.01
41 percent or more	267	0.46	105	0.18	22	0.04

(+) Less than 0.005.

[1]The 4-week time period covers the 4 weeks prior to the teacher completing the questionnaire.

[2]Means include those teachers with 0 occurrences.

[3]Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 13a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating how safe they feel at certain school locations: United States, 1990-91

School location	Level of safety			
	Safe	Moderately safe	Moderately unsafe	Unsafe
In the school building during school hours	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.1
In the school building after school hours	1.3	1.3	0.6	0.4
On school grounds/campus	1.1	1.0	0.4	0.2
In the neighborhood of the school	1.4	1.0	0.6	0.7

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Table 14a.--Standard errors of the percentage of teachers indicating that they feel safe or moderately safe at certain school locations, by instructional level and location of school: United States, 1990-91

School location	Total	School characteristic					
		Instructional level*		Location of school			
		Elementary	Secondary	City	Urban fringe	Town	Rural
In the school building during school hours	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.0
In the school building after school hours	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.9	1.1	1.0	0.8
On school grounds/campus	0.5	0.7	0.5	1.3	0.7	0.6	0.5
In the neighborhood of the school	1.0	1.4	1.0	2.3	1.4	1.1	0.8

*Some schools have both elementary and secondary grades. These schools are not listed separately because their number is small; they are included in the total and in analyses with other school characteristics.

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 42, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

Appendix B: Questionnaire

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208-5651 **TEACHER SURVEY ON SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS** **FAST RESPONSE SURVEY SYSTEM**	FORM APPROVED O.M.B. No.: 1850-0657 EXPIRATION DATE: 12/91

This survey is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e-l). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

DEFINITIONS FOR THIS SURVEY:

Drug use education refers to learning activities and related policies to prevent or reduce alcohol, drug (e.g., marijuana, inhalants, cocaine), and tobacco use by youth. It does not include clinical treatment or rehabilitation.

Disruptive behavior refers to serious and/or unlawful actions that may interfere with order in school (e.g., physical attacks, property destruction, thefts). Alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution should be reported separately on this questionnaire and not included under "disruptive behavior."

Misbehavior refers to less serious actions that may interfere with classroom teaching (e.g., student talking in class, tardiness, class cutting).

AFFIX LABEL HERE

IF ABOVE INFORMATION IS INCORRECT, PLEASE UPDATE DIRECTLY ON LABEL.

Name of Person Completing This Form:_____ Telephone Number:_____

Title/position:_____

What is the best day/time to reach you at this number, if we have any questions? _____ Day _____ Time

RETURN COMPLETED FORM TO:

WESTAT, INC.
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1850-0657, Washington, D.C. 20503.

NCES Form No. 2379-42, 4/91

1. a. About how many students do you teach in a class? _____ students. b. In one day? _____ students.
   c. How many hours a day do you usually teach classes? _____ hours.

2. Circle the number indicating to what extent, if any, each of the following has been a problem in your school during the 1990-9 school year.

		SERIOUS	MODERATE	MINOR	NOT A PROBLEM
a.	Student tardiness	1	2	3	4
b.	Student absenteeism/class cutting	1	2	3	4
c.	Physical conflicts among students	1	2	3	4
d.	Robbery or theft of items over $10	1	2	3	4
e.	Vandalism of school property	1	2	3	4
f.	Student alcohol use	1	2	3	4
g.	Student drug use	1	2	3	4
h.	Sale of drugs on school grounds	1	2	3	4
i.	Student tobacco use	1	2	3	4
j.	Student possession of weapons	1	2	3	4
k.	Trespassing	1	2	3	4
l.	Verbal abuse of teachers	1	2	3	4
m.	Physical abuse of teachers	1	2	3	4
n.	Racial tensions	1	2	3	4

3. Circle the number for each item describing your school's general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies. *(Pleas describe the components separately, even if they are included in a single policy.)*

		GENERAL DISCIPLINE POLICY		ALCOHOL POLICY		DRUG POLICY		TOBACCO POLICY	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
a.	Does your school have a written policy? *(If NO to a policy, skip items b-e for that policy.)*	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
b.	Comprehensive?	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
c.	Clear?	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
d.	Consistently applied?	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
e.	Widely publicized?	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2

4. Circle the number indicating how effective you think your school's alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention programs and policie have been in reducing problems in your school during the 1990-91 school year. *(If alcohol, drug, or tobacco use has not been problem in your school, circle 5.)*

		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	MODERATELY EFFECTIVE	NOT VERY EFFECTIVE	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE	HAS NOT BEEN A PROBLEM
a.	Student alcohol use	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Student drug use	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Student tobacco use	1	2	3	4	5

5. Circle the number indicating how effective you think your school's general discipline programs and policies have been i reducing problems in your school during the 1990-91 school year. *(If there have not been any discipline problems in your school circle 5.)*

		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	MODERATELY EFFECTIVE	NOT VERY EFFECTIVE	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE	HAS NOT BEEN A PROBLEM
a.	Disruptive behavior	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Misbehavior	1	2	3	4	5

6. a. Have you ever received training regarding your school's general discipline programs and policies? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   b. Please estimate the number of inservice training hours on your school's general discipline programs and policies you will have received during the 1990-91 school year. _____ hours.

7. a. Have you ever received training regarding your school's drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use prevention program and policies? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   b. Please estimate the number of inservice training hours on your school's drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use prevention programs and policies you will have received during the 1990-91 school year. _____ hours.

   (If NO to 7a, skip to Q9.)

8. Circle the number indicating whether each of the following components was included in the training you received regarding drug use prevention programs and policies. Check the three components that you feel are most effective in reducing student drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use.

		YES	NO	MOST EFFECTIVE
a.	Causes and effects of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	1	2	_____
b.	Identifying signs of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	1	2	_____
c.	Intervention techniques for your use with students suspected of alcohol, drug, or tobacco use	1	2	_____
d.	Application and enforcement of alcohol policies	1	2	_____
e.	Application and enforcement of drug policies	1	2	_____
f.	Application and enforcement of tobacco policies	1	2	_____
g.	Laws regarding alcohol, drug, or tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution	1	2	_____
h.	Availability of school services and other services for students using alcohol, drugs, or tobacco	1	2	_____

9. Circle the number indicating to what extent each of the following limits your ability to maintain order and discipline in the school.

		LIMITS ABILITY TO MAINTAIN ORDER AND DISCIPLINE			
		GREAT EXTENT	MODERATE EXTENT	SMALL EXTENT	NOT AT ALL
a.	Lack of or inadequate number of security personnel	1	2	3	4
b.	Lack of or inadequate teacher training in discipline procedures and school law	1	2	3	4
c.	Lack of or inadequate alternative placements/programs for disruptive students	1	2	3	4
d.	Likelihood of complaints from parents	1	2	3	4
e.	Lack of support from administration	1	2	3	4
f.	Faculty's fear of student reprisal	1	2	3	4
g.	Other (*specify*)_____	1	2	3	4

10. Circle the number indicating to what extent each of the following interferes with your teaching.

		GREAT EXTENT	MODERATE EXTENT	SMALL EXTENT	NOT AT ALL
a.	Student alcohol use	1	2	3	4
b.	Student drug use	1	2	3	4
c.	Student disruptive behavior	1	2	3	4
d.	Student misbehavior	1	2	3	4

11. a. Has a student from your school ever verbally abused you? ☐ Yes ☐ No.
    b. In the **last 4 weeks** of school? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If YES, how many times? _____
12. a. Has a student from your school ever threatened to injure you? ☐ Yes ☐ No.
    b. In the **last 12 months**? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If YES, how many times? _____
13. a. Has a student from your school ever physically attacked you? ☐ Yes ☐ No.
    b. In the **last 12 months**? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If YES, how many times? _____

14. Circle the number indicating how safe you feel:

		SAFE	MODERATELY SAFE	MODERATELY UNSAFE	UNSAFE
a.	In the school building during school hours	1	2	3	4
b.	In the school building after school hours	1	2	3	4
c.	On school grounds/campus	1	2	3	4
d.	In the neighborhood of the school	1	2	3	4

15. What is the average daily rate of absenteeism (excused and unexcused) in your classes? _____%
16. a. How many years have you been teaching? _____ years. b. In this school? _____ years.
17. What grades are you currently teaching? (*Circle all that apply.*)

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

18. What is your sex? ☐ Female ☐ Male
19. a. What is your race? ☐ Black ☐ White ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native ☐ Other (*specify*)_____
    b. Are you of Hispanic origin? ☐ Yes ☐ No.

United States
Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208–5651

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, $300

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Education
Permit No. G–17

FOURTH CLASS BOOK RATE

MS-5725 NCES-91-091P (84822)

ACQUISITIUNS LIBRARIAN
FACILITY
ERIC PRUCESSING & REFERENCE
2440 RESEARCH BOULEVARD, #550
ROCKVILLE MD 20850-3238

BEST COPY AVAILABLE